DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 194 650 UD 020 880

AUTHOR Burmeister, Klaus H.
TITLE Hierarchical School Bureaucracy and the Challenge of Multicultural Education.
PUB DATE Dec 79
NOTE 30p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Change: *Administrative Organization; Bureaucracy; *Change Strategies; *Cultural Pluralism; *Educational Administration; Educational Demand; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Multicultural Education; Organizational Change
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

Educational bureaucracies are inherently resistant to change. However, the emerging pluralistic philosophy in Canada requires innovation and creativity. Public demands for the integration of multiculturalism into the educational mainstream conflict with the bureaucratic resistance to change and result in a disequilibrium which in turn causes still greater resistiveness. Workable compromises can be reached only by turning from a priori resistiveness to change to a dispassionate analysis of its merits. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED194650

Hierarchical School Bureaucracy and the Challenge of Multicultural Education

by

Klaus H. Burmeister

UD020880

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Klaus H. Burmeister

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

December 1979

University of Regina
Regina, Canada

All formal organizations, and particularly highly bureaucratized hierarchies such as the public education system, are characterized by an inherent resistance to change and innovation when interacting with their environment. Treating the environment "as information which becomes available to the organization,"[1] as Dill states, is, of course, of paramount significance to the educational bureaucracy, and should be a continuous process.

Creative problem solving traditionally falls to the senior executive levels of the organization and must encompass

> adequate "radar" facilities for scanning its environment; that [the system] is staffed with individuals and units to carry out the important intelligence functions and individuals and units to maintain a vigorous long-range planning activity.... adequate technical skills and imagination for the development of new programs in the areas calld for. 2

Implicit in this ideal-type assessment is the awareness that necessary innovation and change can only come about if there is a symbiotic relationship between high-level and low-level functionaries as well as with the clientele to be served, i.e. if all can share to at least some extent in innovative or required reformatory processes. In the case of resistance to change from any systems component, if persistent, we are soon faced with systemic resistance to change and innovation per se.

---

[1] William R. Dill, "The Impact on Environment on Organizational Development," in Sidney Mailick and Edward H. Van Ness, Concepts and Issues in Administrative Behavior (Prentice-Hall, 1962), p.96.

[2] Herbert A. Simon, "The Decision Maker as Innovator," in Mailick and Van Ness, op. cit., p. 68.

In the case of the public school system, which we will be concerned with in the following, inertia with respect to 'progressive' approaches in education has become a serious problem. This system-wide attitude is dictated in part by the rigid structural matrix of a basically Weberian bureaucracy, and in part by the resulting complex social interactions, codes, traditions, protective mechanisms, and internal politics of the organization.

Hierarchical school bureaucracy, because of its reluctance to accept changes for the status quo, appears to be running counter to public interest with increasing frequency. Rising tension, in turn, affects quality education and the maintenance of good relations with the community. As Rogers has shown in his analysis of the New York public school system[3], in the extreme case the public education system as a whole can become a vexing community problem in its own right.

Remedial action, even in the case of clearly perceived deficiencies is difficult

a. because the public education system is monopolistic in nature and, therefore, almost impervious to extraneous sanctions

b. because effective defense mechanisms 'buffer' or dissipate criticisms levelled at the system, and

c. because persistent demands for change are routinely channelled into 'controllable' action patterns, which demonstrate the system's resiliency and ability to ingest and modify innovations, rather than to rise to the challenge of demands for fundamental changes.

---

[3] David Rogers, 110 Livingston Street (Random House, 1968).

Of these, the first is undoubtedly the most obvious and allows of little discussion. The second and third are complementary, even though they address themselves to the basic problem in different ways. 'Buffering' is the process of taking the edge of 'innovative' proposals by subjecting them to committee action, referrals, expert opinions, feasibility studies and the like; invariably, the effects of time and the system's machinations combine to bleed the innovation of its life blood. Resiliency, on the other hand, is the school-bureaucratic capacity for absorbing protest (the oyster effect), for externalizing blame levelled at the system, and for pointing to 'paper accomplishments' as evidence of cooperative action and effective performance - all for the purpose of obviating, or at least mitigating the effects of unplanned changes.

To summarize, the hierarchical school bureaucracy is in essence a reactive rather than a responsive entity whose inertia frequently conflicts with the principles of efficiency, professionalism, and even prudence in relating to political change. It is this latter point which, in the context of Canada's socio-political development in the past ten years has focused public attention on the alleged inadequacies of the educational system and its mandated public accountability.

From a study of classical bureaucratic models it is easily seen that hierarchical structures are constitutionally in conflict with the emerging egalitarian creed of our society. As recent history has shown, massive political and social pressures within our pluralistic society are clearly directed against the 'closed' system, whose

internal distinctions of rank and power are anything but egalitarian and, therefore, suspect. The educational system is one of the prime targets for reform demands. Its traditional defense mechanisms are not proving effective against this challenge which, if it is not accommodated, will expose the bureaucratic machinery to the threat of external intervention.

We are experiencing such an extraordinary situation at the present time because of Canada's emerging pluralistic philosophy. Specifically in the field of education, no issue is more hotly debated than that of 'multicultural' education, which has had a long and troubled history[4], but which is now riding the comet's tail of the national unity issue to ever-increasing prominence in the political forum.

> Educational provisions for minorities conceived in a framework of appreciation of, and diffusion and development of the intrinsic worth of each constituent group enable Canada to assert its distinctive identity and assist in building national unity by commanding the respect and participation of all constituent communities. 5

Jaenen's statement provides a programmatic perspective of the social realities of today. For the school system it represents a challenge to initiate and accept innovative concepts in its adminis-

---

[4] The history of education with respect to minorities in early Canada is replete with examples of 'Anglo-Saxon teachers imbued with a missionary sense of service in each 'foreign' community." Ethnicity and indigenous cultural values were invariably suppressed by the assimilative educational system.
Cornelius J. Jaenen, "Minority Group Schooling and Canadian National Unity," in Journal of Educational Thought, Vol. 7, No. 2 (August 1973), p. 90.

[5] Ibid., p.93.

trations and classrooms, to make it a pragmatic as well as a philosophical program. It was the tacit acceptance of the 'intrinsic worth of each constituent' which had finally propelled the issue of ethnic minority demands into the debate for educational reforms. The impetus for greater assertiveness in matters cultural had come out of the great Anglo-French debate. Suddenly, it seems, native peoples and the more than one quarter non-French and non-English citizens of Canada have been galvanized from an apathetic constituency into a highly politicized activist movement.

In the context of this paper on bureaucratic inertia this phenomenon of 'public demands' for specialized education dramatizes the inexorable adjustment process which must now take shape, however slowly. This coalescence of diffuse ethno-cultural interests in Canada into a powerful public lobby demanding cultural recognition in the educational system must be ascribed

a. to an overall rise in cultural ethnocentrism characteristic of a society of immigrants, the national unity issue, and the devaluation of the assimilative theory (melting pot concept), and

b. to the gradual and concomitant abatement of ethnic self-consciousness which had been fostered by poor treatment in the past.

It is only exceptional external pressure arising from such social conditions which can hope to be effective in forcing change and innovation in a Weberian-type bureaucracy, pressure which does not come from within the system itself (although there certainly is sympathy and support for it), and which constitutes an existential challenge to the bureaucracy's very survival. Can such pressure be identified with respect to the multicultural education issue ?

1. National Policy Reorientation.

Federal policy, as of late, recognizes multiculturalism as a social program "... that speaks to the very definition of this country and is vital to any discussion of political participation."[6] By this policy the federal government also indicates that a) education must be the springboard for the success of such a social program, and b) that ethnic minority interests must be realized through political action of its proponents. The Provinces, which are responsible for education in Canada, are beginning to pick up these signals from Ottawa, and are asking their own educational bureaucracies to provide "instruction challenging cultural awareness and ethnic attachment."[7]

2. The Example of Special-Status Minorities.

In Saskatchewan, for example, ethnic minorities are keenly aware of special cultural and educational support programs of both levels of government for aboriginal peoples, Metis, and Fransaskois (francophone Saskatchewanians).[8] A recently announced 'Affirmative

---

[6] Address by the Hon. Steve Paproski, Minister of State for Multiculturalism to the Biennial Conference of the Canadian Ethnic Studies Association in Vancouver, B.C. (13 October 1979). Unpubl. m.s., released by the Dept. of the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism, p. 6.

[7] From an address by the Saskatchewan Minister of Education to delegates of the Saskatchewan Council of Educational Administration, Regina, 21 September 1979.
"Educators told to get Public more involved in Decisions," in Leader Post, Regina (22 September 1979), p. 4.

[8] Brief submitted to the Canadian Consultative Council on Multiculturalism by the Multicultural Council of Saskatchewan (29 October 1977). Unpubl. m.s. pp. 3-5.

Action Program' for native peoples, and the success of a special interest group in pushing the creation of Type A Francophone Schools in Regina are conducive to the formulation of similar requests from other minority groups. Demands for a larger slice of the educational pie for general ethno-cultural self-actualization is a foreseeable consequence.[9]

3. Ethnic Maturation.

The rapid increase in the number of ethno-cultural (primarily language-oriented) programs outside the formal educational system, such as weekend- and church schools,[10] bear strong testimony to an as yet diffuse, but nevertheless intense public preoccupation with minority cultural rights, languages and traditions. Public opinion is strong that only by integrating these into the educational mainstream will lingering pejorative views of ethnic aspirations disappear.

Hierarchical school bureaucracies have not fully appreciated this growing national assertiveness and they have been slow to react. School-bureaucratic intractableness is evident in the proliferation

---

[9] For example, a spokesman for the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies in Edmonton recently suggested that the formula for federal aid to Francophones living outside Quebec ($ 12 per person p.a.) also be applied to give cultural support to ethnic Ukrainian-Canadians. This would provide an annual 6 million dollar budget to that one ethnic group. "Ukrainian Language Action Urged," Leader Post, Regina (19 October 1979), p. 3.

[10] For example, the Saskatchewan Dept. of Culture and Youth has awarded 'Language Opportunities Grants' to 43 community and church schools in 1979, providing instruction to children in 16 languages. Cf. "Grants 1979/80," in Saskatchewan Multicultural Newsletter, Vol. 1, No. 2 (September 1979), p. 3.

of half-hearted or half-way measures to assuage multicultural community demands. Local experiments, compensatory programs, and protracted feasibility studies reveal this agonizing over unforeseen and unplanned-for demands. Systems response is often inadequate. And not surprisingly 'band-aid' programs are rejected by the community as tokenism. Actual system-wide curriculum reforms, in-service training, and comprehensive affirmative action programs, on the other hand, are still the exception, rather than the rule. A growing restiveness in the public forum, as reflected in the media almost daily, speaks to the fact that societal needs are not being met as expeditiously as they should.

The conflict between the traditional and the progressive educational perspective vis à vis the inclusion of minority cultural demands addresses a fundamental issue. At the heart of it is that political and cultural pluralism demands 'creativity' for solving social problems[11], whereas hierarchical bureaucracy is constitutionally opposed to it, since creativity, by definition, abhors the status quo. In the school bureaucracy a tight check on creative activity is a systems defense mechanism with implications for vested interests in the idiographic sphere as well.

It has been argued with some justification that perhaps the hierarchical systems of administering education have been functioning too well, rather than becoming obsolete,[12] "... consistent

---

[11] Cf. Reinhold Neibuhr, "A Note on Pluralism," in John Cogley, ed., Religion in America (Meridian, 1958), p. 44.

[12] Herbert A. Simon, in fact, contends that hierarchical structures cannot become de facto obsolete because "... the near universality

with the type of societal structure they've been designed to promote and maintain."[13] If this is so, the climate for innovation and change has never been more favorable. No doubt, Canadian society is adjusting to the idea of a major overhaul of its educational philosophy and the bureaucracies which govern it. But this new reality should also be viewed soberly. The hierarchical bureaucracy must be modified, but it will not be replaced by a dramatically different administrative framework. New elements, programs and approaches will have to be tested first, only then will they become a constitutent part of the administrative system.

As far as the present situation is concerned, the status quo (i.e. a mono- or bi-cultural educational philosophy) is no longer equal to demands for change. The resulting disequilibrium represents an "occasion for innovation" which encourages a positive attitude toward novel concepts. When these finally make inroads into hidebound bureaucratic practices there is an "adaptive response" by the system. As far as multicultural education as a total educational concept is concerned, Canada is still a long way from achieving that goal. However, bringing the problem into focus is a first and necessary step toward achieving that end.

---

of hierarchy in the composition of complex systems suggest[s] that there is something fundamental in this structural principle that goes beyond the peculiarities of human organization."
Herbert A. Simon, "Some Fundamentals of Organizational Design," in A.M. Willms and W.D.K. Kernaghan, eds., Public Administration in Canada : Selected Readings (Methuen, 1968), p. 118.

13 Thomas A. Arciniega, "Why the recent Rodriguez, Serrano, and similar Court Actions aren't enough : A Critique of Public Education," in Journal of Instructional Psychology, Vol. 12, No. 4 (1975), p. 2.

The Bureaucracy : Systemic Resistance to Change.

Having postulated that the hierarchical school bureaucracy is not easily moved from its once-established action patterns, we must first look closely at the idiosyncracies of the system itself, in order to understand the disconcerting effects of a 'disequilibrium' generated by 'uncontrolled' innovation and change which, in turn, cause yet greater resistiveness.

Abbott has suggested that bureaucratic resistance to change is attributable to the protection of 'sunken costs,' i.e. investments made in regard to "... training and experience, and of a psychological commitment to particular ways of programming activities."[14] In the case of school bureaucracies this observation is certainly valid, however, it must be augmented by equally cogent factors involving the social dimension, the structural elements and the collectivity of orientation.[15] It is, for example, an established view that far-reaching systemic changes and program adjustments will result in a complex social change process as well, after which it will take some time before systems equilibrium is again reached.

It is already at this juncture that we become aware of a basic dichotomy between 'system' and 'orientation' in the school bureaucracy which accounts for much of the tension between the

---

[14] Max G. Abbott, "Hierarchical Impediments to Innovation in Educational Organizations," in F.D. Carver and T.J. Sergiovanni, eds., Organizations and Human Behavior : Focus on Schools (McGraw-Hill, 1969), p. 43.

[15] Cf. Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott Formal Organizations : A Comparative Approach. (Chandler, 1962), p. 2 ff.

educational system and its clientele. In conformance with the principles of the Weberian-type bureaucratic model the relevance of non-hierarchical expertise is frequently disparaged, or at least 'put in its place.' In addition, the Weberian ideal-type construct is predicated on the performance of routine tasks and performance patterns, whereas the school system, as we know it, demands specialization and expertise even at its lowest levels. This orientation, in turn, requires constant flexible and innovative interaction with the public - a flexibility which is not reflected by the administrative bureaucracy as a whole.

It would appear then, that the hierarchical school bureaucracy is, at times, functionally at odds with itself. A closer look at the Weberian model will perhaps point out other such dysfunctional phenomena which would explain the educational system's apparent ambivalence toward the implementation of multicultural curricula as demanded by a large part of the public.

Weber's bureaucratic paradigm, it should be noted, was drawn in large part from the historical example of organizations functionning in Western Europe at the turn of the century, and reflects organizational patterns which then closely articulated a 'static' social and educational system. A similar stasis persisted in the philosophical approaches to education in Canada with respect to the policy of inculcating the non-British citizenry with British cultural values, and in pursuing rigid methods, procedures and curricula, which are now being challenged. The primary congruencies between the Weberian paradigm and a prototype school bureaucracy may be summarized as follows:

1. Hierarchical Structure and Authority.

The Weber paradigm : Superordinates direct the efforts of subordinates in a pyramidal organizational stratigraphy which encompasses the decision-making process, communications, social interactions, and allocates commensurate powers to accomplish respective tasks at each level.

The School Bureaucracy : Here, too, a rigid hierarchy of authority is clearly in evidence, even though 'hierarchy' (because of its feudal connotations) is frequently metamorphosed into more palatable terminology, such as 'organizational chart' or 'reporting sequence.' Hierarchical formalism is supplemented by hierarchical expectations in the form of unwritten rules, the neglect of which places individual career expectations in as much jeopardy as if explicit directives had been violated.

2. Rules and Functions.

The Weber paradigm : Duties of offices and functionaries are clearly specified, and are promulgated by means of general and abstract rules to assure the realization of programs and objectives.

The School Bureaucracy : One set of rules addresses the overall objective (purpose), a second, generally more complex one (policy), serves to establish uniformity of performance through the development of standards which control the behavior of functionaries in the system.

3. Impersonality.

The Weber paradigm : Members of a bureaucratic organization, while personally free, observe the duties of their respective offices in an 'impersonal' manner.

The School Bureaucracy : The spirit of 'formalistic impersonality' more than any other aspect tends to separate the administrative from the teaching sphere within the system. In the latter it would be an inappropriate response to public involvement and collegial interaction. But in the educational bureaucracy per se functional impersonality clearly distinguishes between required rational action in the working environment and the 'uncontrolled' or diffuse behavior of office incumbents in the private sphere.

4. Special Competence and Expertise.

The Weber paradigm : As a defining characteristic this aspect of hierarchical bureaucracy relates to the complexity of the task to be performed. Its results are systems efficiency on one hand, but also unavoidable compartmentalization of individual effort (resulting in 'tunnel vision') on the other. As a consequence, special interest groups form additional formal and informal social systems which facilitate even greater manipulative control by the bureaucracy of the entire organization.

The School Bureaucracy : It depends on specialization for the factoring of tasks to be accomplished. There is further differentiation in regard to respective administrative and teaching functions.

5. Advancement and Rewards.

The Weber paradigm : The career structure assures, at least in principle, advancement through recognition of merit and seniority which is to promote efficiency and loyalty. Patronage, a non-objective consideration, continues to be an endemic problem, even though its most flagrant abuses (e.g. nepotism) are disavowed.

The School Bureaucracy : Career rewards in the form of promotions, salaries, incentives, fringe benefits, and pensions echo the classical prescription. The hierarchical school bureaucracy promotes according to length of service, technical competence and demonstrated achievements. Patronage exists in the guise of individual 'sponsorship' ("he is 'our' man") as well as in the form of remedial social programs ('affirmative action').

When thus viewed as an exponent of the classical model, the hierarchical school bureaucracy reveals itself to be dysfunctional with respect to change/innovation because of its structural and interactional imperatives.

Yet, as an ideal abstraction bureaucracy is the technically most satisfactory form of organizational action. Based on the propositions of legitimacy and authority, Weber would argue, its reliability precision and continuity offer the best system for an increasingly bureaucratized world.[16] But Weber also neglected to examine bureaucratic inefficiencies, giving rise to the well-founded claim that his model represents a conglomerate of "impressionistic assertions" which defies classification as a truly "functional scheme."[17] It is in the works of some of his critics that we find corroboration for the need to acknowledge the participatory interests of our pluralistic society in bureaucratic processes.

---

[16] Cf. S.M. Lipset, "Political Sociology," in Robert K. Merton et al., eds., Sociology Today. Problems and Prospects. (Random House, 1959), pp. 81-114.

[17] Blau and Scott, op. cit., p. 34.

Merton,[18] for example points to unanticipated self-defeating consequences of rules demanding an excessive emphasis on precision and reliability in bureaucratic administration because they promote the type of administrative group solidarity which opposes innovation and change. Thus, whereas the hierarchical school bureaucracy is supposed to serve the collective public will, the very norms of its 'impersonality' place it in conflict with the public interest.[19] In another vein, Selznick[20] attacks the "romance of numbers"[21] of the hierarchical bureaucracy, i.e. its tendency to metastasize vertically and horizontally. By analyzing the division of functions, Selznick shows how subunits can and will set up objectives of their own which may actually conflict with the overall organizational objectives, threatening the delicate balance between those who serve and those who must be served. The lack of responsiveness to demands for innovation and change is

---

[18] Cf. Robert Merton, "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," in R.M., Reader in Bureaucracy (Free Press, 1952), pp. 361-71.

[19] "... the reduction in personalized relationships ... facilitates the development of an esprit de corps - that is, increases the extent to which goals are perceived as shared among members of the group. Such a sense of commonness of purpose, interests and character increases the propensity of organization members to defend each other against outside pressures. This, in turn solidifies the tendency toward rigid behavior..."
James G. March and Herbert A. Simon, "Dysfunctions in Organizations," in Gerald D. Bell, ed., Organizations and Human Behavior (Prentice-Hall, 1967), p. 92.

[20] Ibid., pp. 93-94.

[21] A danger readily admitted by Weber. Cf. M.W., The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, trans. Talcott Parsons (Scribner's, 1930), p. 84.

thereby further exacerbated. Both Merton and Selznick are less concerned with the problems arising out of the abstruseness of an 'ideal'-model than with the fact that the formal specifications of such a bureaucracy fail to circumscribe the role incumbents' actual behavior. Every functionary has attitudes as a social being which go beyond that which is delineated by the formal code. And it is intangibles like motivation, fear, prejudice, cliques, and friendships, which defy generalization and can only be assessed on an individual analysis basis. Empirical studies in these areas for school bureaucracies are still at a premium.

A third and particularly relevant consideration for the reasons behind school-bureaucratic impediments to change was first explored by Talcott Parsons,[22] and have already been touched on. He took Weber to task for his failure to clearly distinguish between those who have authority and those who have expertise. A basic conflict arises out of the fact that it is nearly always impossible to find matched hierarchical authority and equivalent technical expertise. In the educational system this problem translates into the question of who should be obeyed, the person with the right to command (i.e. the administrator), or the person with the greatest skill and inventiveness at his level of client contact (i.e. the teacher). The off-shoot of such a dilemma is generally vacillation, lack of timely adaptive responses - a first step toward systems inertia. Continuing in the

---

22 Cf. Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham and Roald F. Campbell, Educational Administration as a Social Process. Theory, Research, Practice. (Harper & Row, 1968), pp. 47-48; pp. 134-135.

wake of Parsons, Alvin Gouldner[23] introduced the concept of the 'punishment-centred' vs. the 'representative' bureaucracy. Role incumbents in the former are reluctant to perform tasks assigned to them by, what they consider to be, an alien superstructure which rules by impersonal decree. The latter weds recognition of technical necessity with professional self-interest. Our school-bureaucratic model obviously exhibits characteristics of both.

This brings us to the crucial consideration of bureaucratic behavior with respect to public interest - the cultural dimensions of its actions. Here Reinhard Bendix[24] has done pioneering work. He points to the traditional neglect of human attitudes which, together with formulaic procedures, he maintains, constitute an integral part of organizational success. General social and political values (including shifts in public attitudes and demands) are first forcefully experienced by the low-level role incumbent (the teacher in the educational system) forcing him into difficult choices between rule and process, compliance and initiative.

From the foregoing we can see three major areas of dysfunctionality within the hierarchical school bureaucracy which impinge directly on demands for a more inclusive multicultural education program. The first is that the school bureaucracy, because of its hierarchical structure and attendant authority/task fractionation, encourages differences between superordinate authority (e.g. admin-

---

[23] Bell, op. cit., pp. 94-96.

[24] Cf. Blau and Scott, op. cit., p. 250.

istrator) and subordinate expertness (e.g. teacher). To superimpose the former on the latter as a matter of course without weighing their correlative implications portends instant trouble for the system, because

> this rationalization has led to a general acceptance of the largely nonsensical notion that authority can be delegated to subordinates in the organization, but that responsibility rests with those in superordinate roles. 25

Threatened usurpation of authority calls for strong defense mechanisms, since responsibility all too easily becomes blameability. Proposed innovative concepts (e.g. multicultural curriculum reform) from within the hierarchy's lower levels, therefore, pose an implicit threat to superior authority and must be rejected or 'absorbed'.

The second major dysfunctional consequence obstructing innovation and change, this time with respect to external pressures, relates to the amorphousness of 'public opinion' as a role bearer to which bureaucracy cannot relate. Public opinion, however vigorously expressed in the media, must first be concretized through political action and specific directives before it ever reaches the decision-making levels of school bureaucracy. This is a time-consuming process and, not surprisingly, frequently the reason for charges of unresponsiveness to public demands. The problem is compounded by internal 'status charades'[26] which demand obeisance to privileges of the superordinate by innovative sub-ordinates, not the least of which is that

---

[25] Abbott, op. cit., p. 46.

[26] Ibid., p. 48.

he will determine which problem must receive expeditious handling, and which one will be relegated to the bottom of the 'IN'-tray. Thirdly, the aggressive and innovative individual on the lower rungs of the career ladder soon finds out that his professional creed does not necessarily agree with his expected role function.[27] The requirement of performance in accordance with principles laid down by his colleague group[28] in particular, will be at the heart of his dilemma to choose between a) the conformity expected of him as a role incumbent, and b) the changes whose implementation would be in the best interest of the clientele with which he deals. The higher the level of expertise in the individual, the greater his expectations for a less formalistic work structure - and, therefore, the greater the disaffection if discretionary practices are curtailed for the protection of the bureaucratic system. The trouble is that the hierarchical school bureaucracy has failed to appreciate the inherent limitations of its classical antecedent, i.e. the fact that Weber's paradigm works well for organized production tasks, but not for organized educational tasks.

The Monocratic vs. the Adoptive Approach.

Bureaucracy, generally speaking, becomes malleable to those interests which it does not control only in the presence of massive political and social pressures. That such forces are indeed supporting the issue of multiculturalism in education has already been shown. John

---

[27] For a concise summary of main role conflicts of teachers from the sociologist's point of view, see Getzels, et al., op. cit., pp. 198-211.

[28] Cf. Blau and Scott, op. cit., p. 63.

Q. Public is generally not aware of the systemic deficiencies of the school bureaucracy which impede the implementation of his multicultural aspirations, but he is aware of their effects. And he does have his own perceptions. And some of these, together with an Attitudinal Response Comparison between traditional and proposed action patterns will be helpful in assessing the entire issue.

The intensity and rapidity with which 'multicultural' education has become a national issue is alarming to some, yet it was certainly predictable. For too long the predominant educational policy of cultural assimilation had disparaged the equity issue regarding cultural benefits for Canada's ethnic minorities. Hence the cynical view that Canadian society consists of

> ... a kind of hereditary aristocracy composed of two founding peoples, perpetuating itself from father to son, and a lower order of other ethnic groups, forever excluded from spheres of influence.... [29]

does persist and will only change with an attitudinal re-orientation of the entire society. The place to start is obviously the classroom. But to get the issue even that far it is, first of all, necessary to educate the educators and their administrative superstructure. The issue will not go away, because our pluralistic society insists on the recognition of minority cultural rights, not only for reasons of educational attainment, but because such recognition also enhances the opportunities for the individual to share in the country's economic wealth.

---

[29] Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Book IV : The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups (Ottawa, 1969), para. 398, p. 146. and FN 1.

Public attention has been focused primarily on the social aspects of the educational system. The parent relates to the teacher, not to the remote superintendent, nor to procedures. Nevertheless, the respective role functions of all those involved in the educational system, parent, student, teacher, administrator, represent an entity of human interaction which is ultimately susceptible to societal pressures. Conversely, resistive or obstructive policies are quick to be recognized by those affected. One of the defense mechanisms of the school bureaucracy with respect to 'uncontrolled' external demands for a multicultural orientation of the curriculum is the 'cultural deficit rationale.' This view holds that the irritant of persistent minority culture demands is best met by a policy of bringing minority students 'up to the standard' of the dominant culture, thereby eliminating cultural differentiation. It is reasoned that this approach guarantees at least access to success in modern society. Other bureaucratic defense measures, which especially shed light on the difficult position of the intermediary teacher, have been clearly stated by Arciniega:

> In an effort to insure the continuation of the status quo, school administrators have focused attention of the enforcement of existing rules, norms, and regulations. Activity has been noticeably stepped up to (1) improve on tried and true strategies of old, (2) put safely experienced minority group member specialists in buffer positions ..., and (3) increase inservice efforts to assist teachers to implement those polished-over traditional strategies. All of these are efforts to socialize 'properly' the system's role incumbents and clients. 30

---

30 Arciniega, op. cit., p. 7.

What is often not fully appreciated is the fact that school bureaucratic resistiveness to change affects especially the low-level role incumbent (teacher or administrator) as much as the clientele, and is the cause for much professional disaffection. For school-bureaucratic rules and norms are not only being promulgated to keep educational programs on the charted course, but also to keep the role incumbent at the helm, if necessary through promotional or punitive measures. For the individual to promote minority culture aspirations with their concomitant demands for change and innovation, is to court disfavor with the system. By the same token, indifference to such external demands is unprofessional. The upshot of such unfortunate tensions between role incumbents can alienate the lower level functionaries of the hierarchical school bureaucracy from the superordinate decision-makers. And the gap widens as those at the top charged with the responsibility for innovative action are slow to formulate and implement it. As education is oriented toward professional specialization rather than toward decision-making, the concept is reinforced that no one is able to have a say in that which is the responsibility of another, and thus the problem of inadequate responsiveness persists.

If we are to compare the salient aspects of structure, functionality and attitudes in an archetypal monocratic bureaucracy with those of a systems change model which could replace it, we can observe that the problem of hierarchical impediments to innovation and change are by no means unsolvable.

1. Structure and Authority Network.

The Monocratic Approach : It is characterized by a high degree of centralization.[31] Leadership is hierarchical and authoritarian, reinforced by strict requirements for compliance with directives passed 'down,' while role allegiance faces 'up.' Policy is made in the authority-power substructure of the entire system, relayed through the communications sub-structure, and supported by the effects of status-reward motivations and informal systems interactions. Direct public involvement is neither desired nor encouraged. The system is essentially a 'closed' organism.

The Adaptive Approach : Hierarchy is supplanted by a professional leadership which allows consultative interaction and more decentralized decision-making. As a generous rather than as a stingy power-broker the 'professional' decision-maker encourages participatory management, thereby 'opening' the system and dispelling attitudinal dysfunctions. Responsibility for the maintenance of standards shifts from impersonal codes to informed peer evaluation. Public input is encouraged.

2. Adaptability to Innovation and Change.

The Monocratic Approach : Office incumbents are protective of their status and, therefore, disinclined to change. Status, rewards, and ultimately power are functions of conformity.

The Adaptive Approach : Recognition of specialist status

---

31 Cf. Herbert A. Simon, "Some Fundamentals of Organizational Design," in Willms and Kernaghan, op. cit., pp. 120-123.

enhances professionalism which, in turn, is committed to innovation and adaptation for the maintenance of professional quality.

3. Planning.

The Monocratic Approach : Attempting to preserve the status quo at all costs results in a generally myopic attitude toward long-range planning and anticipatory policies. Reactive measures are in essences defensive measures. Local experimentation with innovative proposals are generally without system-wide consequences.

The Adaptive Approach : Professional orientation demands adaptable and forward-looking planning which heeds macro-societal expectations wherever possible.

Specifically, with respect to the multicultural education issue, there are also two different attitudinal response patterns in these approaches:

1. Minority Languages.

The Traditional View : Minority language instruction is not encouraged, because

a) it conflicts with the culture assimilation theory;

b) it competes for time and effort with the learning of the dominant idiom, which is essential for success in society;

c) it is an unwarranted financial liability for the administrative as well as instructional resources of the system.

The Systems Change View : The use of minority languages must be stressed, because

a) it is an inherent right, a manifestation of cultural values, and an educational necessity;

b) it fosters individual self-esteem and collective cultural interaction in our pluralistic society;

c) it represents a valid cultural tool for taking Canada out of its traditional cultural insularity into the global cultural mainstream.

2. Multicultural Curricula.

The Traditional View : the acquisition of Anglo-cultural values is traditional. Cultural heterogeneity is costly and adversely affects the collective national effort in many fields of endeavor. Multicultural programming should, therefore be selective, and in response to specific local needs.

The Systems Change View : The social actualization of a professedly 'multicultural' nation demands integration of a full range of subjects addressing history, culture, and contributions of ethnic minorities.

3. Community Involvement.

The Traditional View :

1) Outside pressure for change may be well-intentioned, but it is not well informed; if complied with, it has the tendency to force a lowering of standards.

2) 'Professionals know best.'

3) Minority reform demands cannot be met for all minorities; resulting inequalities will only fuel controversy. Therefore, 'external demands' must be carefully 'controlled.'

The Systems Change View :

1) The public has the right to share in operational as well as in educational concerns of the school bureaucracy;

2) The present philosophy is inadequate because it is elitist;

3) Public participation furnishes needed insights into the solving of educational as well as other social problems.

Summary.

This paper, in general, has concerned itself with demonstrating the nature of inherent resistiveness to change found in the Weberian-type school-administrative bureaucracy; and it has specifically focused on the rising public demand for an innovative integration of multi-cultural aspirations into the educational mainstream.

Education, because of its increasing size, commitment, and complexity must be carried on in formal organizations. At the same time systemic limitations (here we have examined factors of resistiveness) inhibit and interfere with necessary adaptation and, consequently, with the attainment of maximal efficiency among internal reciprocal systems, internal and external agencies, and even with the school system's purpose.[32] The school bureaucracy's resistance to change is regarded as a barrier to creativity, whereas creativity is at the heart of the flexible (systems change) model. The hierarchical perspective is that excessive intellectualism and concomitant experimentation will disrupt the foundations of order. This problem remains a vexing one and cannot be generalized, either with respect to the Weberian antecedent, or with respect to the hierarchical school bureaucracy per se. Only individual empirical studies can determine whether resistiveness and systems inertia do, in fact, sacrifice intrinsic function to facile

---

[32] Cf. J.D. Millett, "Organization as a Problem in Human Relations," in Willms and Kernaghan, op. cit., pp. 309-311.

administrative success, or if they are mere irritants of minor consequence.[33] General recommendations, as, for example, those proposed by Brown, Dye, and Dror,[34] can only circumscribe areas of systemic interaction and draw attention to their predisposition for dysfunctionality. With respect to the 'multicultural' education question, respective attitudinal positions of the hierarchical educational system and minority demands have been outlined. They postulate the necessity for an organizational reassessment of society's educational needs, which is always the first social implication of school-bureaucratic responsibility. The task of elucidating, reconciling, and actualizing the principal educational needs of society is not made any easier by the fact that public opinion is often self-contradictory because of its pluralistic nature.

The crucial step in effecting workable compromises remains one of attitude rather than of posture, i.e. to turn from a priori resistiveness to proposed change to dispassionate analysis of its merits by drawing on the concerted talents of both the administrator and the specialist. Only in this manner can the hierarchical school

---

[33] A number of prominent analysts of bureaucracy have pointed to the fact that relevant concepts "were part of a conceptual frame of reference which tended to exclude the possibility of formulating generalizations about administrative inefficiency." Martin Albrow, Bureaucracy (Pall Mall Press, 1970), p.85.

[34] Cf. Alan F. Brown, "Research in Organizational Dynamics: Implications for School Administrators," in W.G. Walker, A.R. Crane and A. Ross Thomas, eds., Explorations in Educational Administration (U. of Queensland Press, 1973), pp. 302-304.; Thomas R. Dye, Understanding Public Policy (Prentice-Hall, 1972), pp. 17-37; Yehezkel Dror, Public Policymaking Reexamined. (Chandler, 1968), pp. 12-16.

bureaucracy perform its social function of discerning changing demands while, at the same time, conforming to the values of a pluralistic society.